## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

|  |   | <u> </u>  |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
|--|---|---|------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Name of Assigned Judge<br>or Magistrate Judge              |   | 1 1111111111111111111111111111111111111   | G. Reinhard            | Sitting Judge if Other<br>than Assigned Judge | P. Michae                    | Mahoney                      |  |
| CASE NUMBER 89   |   | C 20168   | DATE                   | June 29, 2001                                 |                              |                              |  |
| CASE PEOI  |   | PLE WHO CARE v. ROCKFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION   |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| мот  | IION:   | [In the following bo<br>nature of the motion  |                        | the motion, e.g., plaintiff, d                | efendant, 3rd party plaintif | f, and (b) state briefly the |  |
|  |   |   |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| DOC  | KET ENTRY:  | <u> </u>  |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (1)  | □ File  | Filed motion of [ use listing in "Motion" box above.]   |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (2)  | □ Bri   | Brief in support of motion due  |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (3)  | □ Ans   | Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due  |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (4)  | □ Rul   | Ruling/Hearing on set for at  |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (5)  | □ Star  | Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at  |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (6)  | □ Pre   | Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at   |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (7)  | □ Tri:  | Trial[set for/re-set for] on at   |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (8)  | □ [Be   | [Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at   |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (9)  |   | This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to]  FRCP4(m)  General Rule 21  FRCP41(a)(1)  FRCP41(a)(2). |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (10)   | [Other docket entry] In accordance with the decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals the attached Memorandum Opinion and Order is hereby entered. |   |                        |   |                              |                              |  |
| (11)   | <b>■</b> [Fo  | r further detail see r  | everse/attached order. | $\mathcal{M}$                                 | Malway                       | M                            |  |
|  | No notices require  | d, advised in open court.   |                        |   |                              | Document<br>Number           |  |
|  | No notices required.  |   |                        |   | number of notices            |                              |  |
| ✓  | Notices mailed by judge's staff.  |   |                        | J   | UN 2 9 2001                  | 210                          |  |
| Notified counsel by telephone.  Docketing to mail notices. |   |   |                        | 7   | date decketed                |                              |  |
| Mail AO 450 form.  |   |   | בואונו במחגו           | uais a  | dockering deputy initials    | -400                         |  |
|  | Copy to judge/mag   | istrate judge.  | CLERK<br>STRICT COURT  | pulk shake to stage stage of                  | 1.0                          |                              |  |
| courtroom deputy's initials                                |   |   | NOC 10                 | date mailed notice                            |                              |                              |  |

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FILED-WD FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS WESTERN DIVISION O JUN 29 AM 10: 2

| PEOPLE WHO CARE, et. al.,                               | U.S. DISTRIC           | K<br>T COURT |
|---|------------------------|--------------|
| Plaintiff,  | ) Case No. 89 C 20168  |              |
| <b>v.</b>   | )<br>)                 | DOCKETED     |
| ROCKFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION<br>SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 205, | ) P. Michael Mahoney ) | JUN 2 9 2001 |
| Defendant.  | )<br>)<br>)            |              |

## Memorandum Opinion and Order

There has been nothing subtle about the Seventh Circuit Court's orders in this case. The order of April 18, 2001 is a good example. Two concepts dominate that order. 1) The decree is to be dissolved as of June 30, 2002 and the District is to be in control of its schools and 2) the district is entitled to no more relief than requested. This court has re-examined the District's October 15, 1999, motion and brief and will now enter an order granting all relief requested, including transferring control of the schools back to the District as of June 30, 2002.

## Therefore, it is hereby ordered:

- Nockford Board of Education School District No. 205 (RSD) is declared to be unitary with respect to all six *Green* factors student assignment, faculty, staff, transportation, extracurricular activities and facilities and student discipline, effective immediately upon entry of this order;
- 2) RSD's sole remaining obligation under the Comprehensive Remedial Order (CRO) is to provide certain *Milliken II* remedies<sup>1</sup> which provide educational and remedial

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> RSD's October 15, 1999, brief specifies that its CRO obligations be limited to funding the following *Milliken II* programs at a rate not to exceed \$19.5 million per annum: 1) Magnet

advantages to the Plaintiff class through June 30, 2002. Effective immediately upon entry of this order, RSD is relieved of any other obligation under the CRO other than is set forth herein;

- The CRO is modified to reflect that nothing contained in the CRO, as modified, shall limit the ability of RSD to fund the required remedy from grants;
- The court Special Master, Dr. Eugene Eubanks, is relieved of all duties and obligations under the CRO as Special Master. The court appoints Dr. Eubanks as a Court Monitor with the responsibility of monitoring the implementation of the *Milliken II* programs and remedies through June 30, 2002. The court will enter a monitoring order, at a later date, which will address the responsibility of the court-appointed monitor.
- Effective June 30, 2002, the remedial decree is dissolved and this case is dismissed with prejudice. The court does retain jurisdiction to enforce this order, including through contempt proceedings, if necessary.

P. MICHAEL MAHONEY, MAGISTRATE JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DATE \$ 26/01

ENTER:

school programs, 2) Bilingual program, 3) Success For All, 4) Reading Recovery, 5) Summer School, 6) Site Based Allocations, 7) All Day Kindergarten, 8) Early Childhood Education, 9) Tutorials and 10) Inservice Training.